



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,484	07/20/2000	Robert Carlquist Smith	99-317	3095

32127 7590 08/16/2004

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.  
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN  
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE  
MAILCODE HQEO3H14  
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/620,484

Applicant(s)

SMITH, ROBERT CARLQUIST

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2665

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
HUY D. VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

09/620,484

Continuation of 2 and 5. NOTE: The amendments to the specification would be entered if presented in an RCE or in an amendment after final in which the amendments to the claims are entered; however, in the present instance the amendments to the claims will not be entered such that the amendments to the specification will also not be entered.

The amendments to the claims will not be entered since the amendments to the claims do not place the application in better form for appeal. The amendments to the claims cancel the limitations of claims 6 and 12 and add these limitations to the independent claims. Examiner notes that claims 6 and 12 were rejected in the Final Rejection using Mattaway and Wiener.

Applicant argues that the combination of Mattaway and Wiener does not disclose the limitations of the amended independent claims since Mattaway and Wiener does not disclose that the calling party's number is stored within the computer. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. Examiner maintains that "storing the calling party telephone number in memory within the computer" is a broad phrase. For example, this limitation can be met if the calling party telephone number is entered into the computer and then transmitted to another location since the computer will store the calling party telephone number in a buffer during the transmission process, where, as broadly defined, a buffer is a memory. Examiner asserts that Wiener discloses such steps in col. 5, lines 22-25 where a calling party telephone number is entered into the computer and then transmitted to another location. Therefore, Applicant's amendments have not placed the claims in condition for allowance. If Applicant wishes for the limitations of canceled claims 6 and 12 to be the patentable feature of the invention, Examiner urges Applicant to amend the claims to further distinguish the claims over the cited prior art. For instance, Applicant could amend the claims to include a limitation specifying that the calling party telephone number is stored in the memory of the computer only once where the stored calling party telephone number is used each time a call is attempted.